



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,897	11/21/2003	Norimitsu Fukami	F-9(KC)/FP 1501	1430
26021	7590	07/29/2008	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067			CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1795		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		07/29/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,897	FUKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DABORAH CHACKO DAVIS	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr Matthew C. Lee, Reg. No. 58,189. (3) _____.

(2) Daborah Chacko-Davis. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 July 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: U. S. Patent No. 6,143,116 (Hayashi et al).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative said that Hayashi does not teach a photocurable slurry, and that the slurry of Hayashi does not fill the gaps between the circuit patterns; and that Hayashi does not teach the process illustrated on page 12 of 16, of the Draft response, filed July 21, 2008, and that Hayashi's method differs from the limitations of the independent claim.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Daborah Chacko-Davis/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

July 25, 2008.